

Serial No.: 09/965,784  
Art Unit: 2618

### REMARKS

Claims 1-17, 19, 20, and 22-32 are currently pending. Claims 1, 3-8, 10, 13-17, 19, 20, 22, 24, 29, and 30 have been amended for clarification purposes only. Claims 6 and 14 have been amended to recite subject matter from allowed claim 26. Claim 31 has been added to enhance the scope of Applicant's patent coverage and is supported by allowed claim 26. Claim 32 has been added to enhance the scope of Applicant's patent coverage and is the apparatus form of method claim 1 and is also supported by claim 17. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added.

The Patent Office is thanked for its allowance of claims 20, 24, and 25. However, applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable.

Applicant's claimed invention relates to a method for relating a plurality of system identifications (SIDs) in a mobile device is provided. The method includes the steps of identifying a plurality of SIDs having a common spatial characteristic, storing the identified plurality of SIDs, comparing a SID received from a wireless service provider to the stored plurality of SIDs and, upon any one of the plurality of stored SIDs matching the received SID, declaring the wireless service provider as being a Home service provider. Alternatively, or in conjunction with comparing received SIDs for the case where none of the plurality of stored SIDs matches the received SID, Applicant's claimed invention further compares a received System Operator Code (SOC) to stored SOC's, including at least one of a Home SOC, a Partner SOC, a Favored SOC and a Forbidden SOC.

The Patent Office rejected claims 1 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bridges, U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2003/0186695, in view of Mauney, U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2005/0159107.

#### Claim 1 recites

A method comprising: storing a system identification that identifies a home service provider for a mobile station; identifying a plurality of system identifications having a common spatial characteristic; storing the identified plurality of system identifications in a memory that is accessible by a mobile station; comparing a system identification received from a wireless service provider to the stored plurality of system identifications;

Serial No.: 09/965,784  
Art Unit: 2618

and upon any one of the plurality of stored system identifications matching the received system identification, declaring the wireless service provider as being a home service provider for the mobile station.

The Patent Office asserted on page 3, lines 2-11, of the Office Action dated January 29 2008, as follows:

identifying a plurality of SIDs having a common spatial characteristic (page 7[0064]i.e., an example of two cellular subscribers (read on “plurality of SID”) who roam into a geographic area (e.g., Austin) from the same market (e.g., Dallas, read on “common partial characteristics”); storing the identified plurality of SIDs in a memory that is accessible by a mobile station (page 2[0013] and page 3[0028]); comparing a SID received from a wireless service provider to the stored plurality of SIDs (page 7[0060]).

Bridges does not explicitly show that upon any one of the plurality of stored SIDs matching the received SID, declaring the wireless service provider as being a home service provider for the mobile station.

Paragraph 0064 of Bridges discloses as follows:

[0064] Because some markets operate using multiple SIDs, PSLs/IRDBs will need to be administered on a per SID basis. Even within a given market (SID), different PSLs/IRDBs will be required to support different classes of service. This can be demonstrated by an example of two cellular subscribers who roam into a geographic area (e.g., Austin) from the same market (e.g., Dallas). If one subscriber desires to receive Short Message Service, they may roam to a service provider supporting that service (e.g., Service Provider A) while the other subscriber who requires only voice (a class of service hereinafter referred to as wireless POTS (Plain Old Telephone Service)) may roam to another service provider providing a more attractive roaming rate (e.g., Service Provider B). This is required because not all service providers will support all classes of service. The roaming paradigm must change to accommodate scenarios like these.

Paragraph 0013 of Bridges discloses as follows:

[0013] The mobile station may include a memory device, such as a number assignment module (NAM), in which an assigned phone number and a system identification code (SID) and/or System Operator Code (SOC) is stored to uniquely identify the home service provider for the

Serial No.: 09/965,784  
Art Unit: 2618

unit. In the North American cellular system, each provider within a market area is assigned a distinct, fifteen bit SID. IS-136 service providers are also assigned a 12-bit SOC for use throughout all their market areas. In Europe, on the other hand, the Global System for Mobile Communications (GSM) standard (see, for example, Recommendation GSM 02.11, Service Accessibility, European Telecommunications Standards Institute, 1992) defines a process for network selection based on the mobile station reading the GSM equivalent of the SID, called the Public Land Mobile Network (PLMN) identity.

Paragraph 0028 of Bridges discloses as follows:

[0028] According to another embodiment of the present invention, a mobile station is provided that comprises a memory and a selector. The memory stores a list of preferred wireless carrier identities based upon a selected class of service for a plurality of market areas. The selector automatically selects a preferred wireless carrier from the list stored in the memory when the mobile station is roaming and enters one of the market areas of the plurality of market areas. Preferably, the mobile station switches to the preferred wireless carrier, selected from the list of preferred wireless carrier identities, to use for communication in response to the mobile station roaming to the predetermined market area. The list of preferred wireless carrier identities may be downloaded to the memory from a message center via a communications link established between the message center and the memory. The communications link may comprise a wireless communications link and/or a hard-wire or wired communications link. Programming of the mobile station unit and entry of preferred wireless carrier identities may also be performed manually by using the keypad of the mobile station unit.

Paragraph 0060 of Bridges discloses as follows:

[0060] At step S.6, the mobile station determines whether it is in its home system or market area. Whether or not the mobile station is located in its home market area may be determined by analyzing the SID, SOC or equivalent system identification number of the cellular service provider for the area in which the mobile station is located. By comparing the SID or SOC received on the control channel with the home SID or SOC of the home service provider, the mobile station may determine whether it is located in its home system. As described above, the home SID or SOC may be stored in the NAM of the mobile station, or may be stored in another appropriate memory or storage device of the mobile station. For example, the home SID or SOC may be stored separately from the PSL/IRDB of the mobile station, or may be stored in memory 67 as part of the PSL/IRDB.

Serial No.: 09/965,784  
Art Unit: 2618

Claim 1 in pertinent part recites as follows:

identifying a plurality of system identifications having a common spatial characteristic; storing the identified plurality of system identifications in a memory that is accessible by a mobile station; comparing a system identification received from a wireless service provider to the stored plurality of system identifications; and upon any one of the plurality of stored system identifications matching the received system identification, declaring the wireless service provider as being a home service provider for the mobile station.

Paragraph 0064 of Bridges discloses that a subscriber may roam to a service provider that provides the class of service the subscriber wants to use at that time. Paragraph 0013 discloses a number assignment module storing “an assigned phone number and a system identification code (SID) and/or System Operator Code (SOC) is stored to uniquely identify the home service provider for the unit.” Paragraph 0028 discloses a mobile station “memory stores a list of preferred wireless carrier identities based upon a selected class of service for a plurality of market areas.” Paragraph 0060 discloses “by comparing the SID or SOC received on the control channel with the home SID or SOC of the home service provider, the mobile station may determine whether it is located in its home system.”

These four paragraphs from Bridges, alone or collectively, do not disclose or suggest “identifying a plurality of system identifications having a common spatial characteristic,” then “storing the identified plurality of system identifications in a memory that is accessible by a mobile station,” and then “comparing a system identification received from a wireless service provider to the stored plurality of system identifications.” Bridges, in paragraph 0064, discloses that if a subscriber is in a market, roaming occurs to find a service provider providing a desired service and **does not disclose identifying a plurality of system identifications having a common spatial characteristic which are then stored and then compared.** The four paragraphs 0013, 0028, 0060, and 0064 of Bridges are not interrelated so as to provide a teaching or suggestion of the claimed sequence of claim 1.

That is to say, that when a subscriber enters a market, e.g., paragraph 0064, of Bridges, any PSL/IRDB or list of SIDs that the subscriber may have is not one disclosed or suggested as identifying a plurality of system identifications having a common spatial characteristic. In

Serial No.: 09/965,784  
Art Unit: 2618

Applicant's claimed invention, there is first an identification of system identifications having a common spatial characteristic which is then stored and later used in a comparison.

The Patent Office admits "Bridges does not explicitly show that upon any one of the plurality of stored SIDs matching the received SID, declaring the wireless service provider as being a home service provider for the mobile station."

Mauney in paragraph 0039 is asserted by the Patent Office, on page 3, lines 12-14, of the Office Action dated January 29 2008, as teaching "upon any one of the plurality of stored SIDs matching the received SID, declaring the wireless service provider as being a home service provider for the mobile station (page 2 [0039])."

Mauney's paragraph 0039 is reproduced below:

[0039] The wireless handset may include a memory device, such as a number assignment module (NAM), in which an assigned phone number (MIN) and a system identification code (SID) is stored to uniquely identify the home service provider for the unit. In addition, the wireless handset may store a unique Electronic Serial Number (ESN) that is assigned to the wireless handset. In the North American cellular system, each cellular market or provider is assigned a distinct, fifteen bit SID. In Europe, on the other hand, the Global System for Mobile Communications (GSM) standard (see, for example, Recommendation GSM 02.11, Service Accessibility, European Telecommunications Standards Institute, 1992) defines a process for network selection based on the wireless handset reading the GSM equivalent of the SID, called the Public Land Mobile Network (PLMN) identity. The SID or equivalent system identification number is broadcast by each service provider or cellular provider and is used by the wireless handset to determine whether or not the wireless handset is operating in its home network or if it is operating in a roaming condition. The wireless handset makes this determination by reading the SID that is broadcast in the cellular market in which it is located, and comparing it to the home SID stored in the NAM of the cellular phone unit. If the SIDs do not match, then the wireless handset is roaming, and the mobile station must attempt to gain service through a non-home service provider. Due to the imposition of a fixed surcharge or higher per unit rate, the airtime charges when the mobile station is roaming are customarily higher than when it is operating within its home network.

The limitation from claim 1 is as follows: "upon any one of the plurality of stored system

Serial No.: 09/965,784  
Art Unit: 2618

identifications matching the received system identification, declaring the wireless service provider as being a home service provider for the mobile station.” All paragraph 0039 of Mauney seems to teach is comparing the broadcast system identification to the home system identification stored in the number assignment module where if there is no match, the wireless handset is considered to be roaming. This teaching from Mauney is not a teaching for “upon any one of the plurality of stored system identifications matching the received system identification” or “upon any one of the plurality of stored system identifications matching the received system identification, declaring the wireless service provider as being a home service provider for the mobile station.”

Mauney also does not remedy the above noted deficiency of Bridges.

Thus, claim 1 is allowable over Bridges over Mauney because 1) Bridges does not teach all the claimed subject matter it is purported to teach and 2) Mauney does not teach the deficiency that the Patent Office does allege exists in Bridges.

Claim 17 recites

An apparatus, comprising: a controller; a wireless transceiver; and at least one memory, the at least one memory comprising a location for storing a home system identification and other locations for storing a plurality of cousin system identifications, wherein a system identification received through said wireless controller is declared by said controller to be a home service provider if the received system identification matches the stored home system identification or any one of the plurality of stored cousin system identifications, wherein the cousin system identifications are stored into said at least one memory under the direction of a prepaid service provider, and correspond to system identifications associated with one or more service providers that service a predetermined geographical area that is defined to be a non-roaming area of a customer of the prepaid service provider, wherein the home system identification is stored in at least one memory without the direction of a prepaid service provider.

The Patent Office has not addressed the previously claimed subject matter of the cousin system identifications are stored into said at least one memory under the direction of a prepaid service provider and the home system identification is stored in at least one memory without the direction of a prepaid service provider, which have been amended for clarification to now recite

Serial No.: 09/965,784  
Art Unit: 2618

“the cousin system identifications are stored into said at least one memory under the direction of a prepaid service provider” and “the home system identification is stored in at least one memory without the direction of a prepaid service provider.”

Where does either Bridges or Mauney disclose or suggest “the cousin system identifications are stored into said at least one memory under the direction of a prepaid service provider” and “the home system identification is stored in at least one memory without the direction of a prepaid service provider?”

Mauney’s paragraph 0039 is reproduced below:

[0039] The wireless handset may include a memory device, such as a number assignment module (NAM), in which an assigned phone number (MIN) and a system identification code (SID) is stored to uniquely identify the home service provider for the unit. In addition, the wireless handset may store a unique Electronic Serial Number (ESN) that is assigned to the wireless handset. In the North American cellular system, each cellular market or provider is assigned a distinct, fifteen bit SID. In Europe, on the other hand, the Global System for Mobile Communications (GSM) standard (see, for example, Recommendation GSM 02.11, Service Accessibility, European Telecommunications Standards Institute, 1992) defines a process for network selection based on the wireless handset reading the GSM equivalent of the SID, called the Public Land Mobile Network (PLMN) identity. The SID or equivalent system identification number is broadcast by each service provider or cellular provider and is used by the wireless handset to determine whether or not the wireless handset is operating in its home network or if it is operating in a roaming condition. **The wireless handset makes this determination by reading the SID that is broadcast in the cellular market in which it is located, and comparing it to the home SID stored in the NAM of the cellular phone unit.** If the SIDs do not match, then the wireless handset is roaming, and the mobile station must attempt to gain service through a non-home service provider. Due to the imposition of a fixed surcharge or higher per unit rate, the airtime charges when the mobile station is roaming are customarily higher than when it is operating within its home network.

Applicant does not see where Mauney discloses or suggests, in paragraph 0039, “the cousin system identifications are stored into said at least one memory under the direction of a prepaid service provider” and “the home system identification is stored in at least one memory

Serial No.: 09/965,784  
Art Unit: 2618

without the direction of a prepaid service provider,” and would appreciate the Patent Office’s identification by column and line number(s) and/or drawing figure and part number(s), with particularity, of this subject matter.

Barring disclosure of such subject matter by both Bridges and Mauney, claim 17 is allowable over these two references, alone or in combination.

The Patent Office rejected claims 4, 7, 9, 10, 12, 15, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bridges in view of Mauney, and further in view of McGregor, U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2001/0000777.

As discussed above, Bridges in view of Mauney does not make obvious either claim 1 or claim 17. Bridges in view of Mauney does not disclose or make obvious declaring a wireless service provider as being a home service provider or home category service provider.

Claim 10 recites

A wireless communication system of a type that transmits system identification (SID) parameters to mobile stations, comprising in mobile stations associated with a prepaid service provider at least one memory storing a SID that identifies a home service provider for the mobile station and a list containing a plurality of other SIDs having a common spatial characteristic, the mobile station comprising a processor that is coupled to the at least one memory and that is responsive to a received SID for comparing the received SID to the SIDs in the list of SIDs and, upon any one of the plurality of SIDs matching the received SID, declaring a wireless service provider that transmitted the SID as being the home service provider for the mobile station.

Similar to the discussion regarding claims 1 and 17, neither Bridges nor Mauney discloses or suggests claim 10’s “a list containing a plurality of other SIDs having a common spatial characteristic” and “responsive to a received SID for comparing the received SID to the SIDs in the list of SIDs and, upon any one of the plurality of SIDs matching the received SID, declaring a wireless service provider that transmitted the SID as being the home service provider for the mobile station.”

Specifically, Bridges in paragraph 0060 does not teach “comparing the received SID to the SIDs in the list of SIDs” of claim 10. Instead, Bridges in paragraph 0060 merely teaches a



Serial No.: 09/965,784  
Art Unit: 2618

comparison of a received SID or a received SOC with the home SID or the home SOC; there is no list. Furthermore, Mauney, in paragraph 0036, does not teach “a list containing a plurality of other SIDs having a common spatial characteristic.”

McGregor, which discloses a home SID and a prepaid mode, does not remedy the deficiency of Bridges and/or Mauney.

Thus, claims 4, 7, 9, 10, 12, 15, and 28 are allowable over Bridges, Mauney, and/or McGregor.

The Patent Office rejected claims 2 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bridges in view of Mauney, and further in view of Mizikovsky, U.S. Patent No. 5,983,115.

As discussed above, Bridges in view of Mauney does not make obvious either claim 1 or claim 17 and does not disclose or make obvious declaring a wireless service provider as being a home service provider or home category service provider.

Mizikovsky discloses (abstract) a communication device that locates a wireless service provider in a multi-service provider environment using a stored list of preferred service providers, the list has a plurality of uniquely identified sublists, each sublist is associated with a different geographic area and identifies a more preferred service provider and a less preferred service provider. Mizikovsky discloses (col. 8, lines 36-41) the mobile communication device registers with the best stored SOC or SID, that is, an SOC or SID that has at least been associated with a preferred service provider in which the best service provider is identified by comparing the stored SOC or SID with the list of preferred SOC or SID. Mizikovsky seeks to determine if a received SID or SOC is an optimal, preferred, or prohibited service provider (col. 5, lines 57-67) and does not appear to disclose or suggest assigning a home service provider (e.g., col. 3, lines 10-18). In contrast, the claimed invention in claims 2, 3, and 11 recites that if a received SID matches one of a plurality of SIDs, then the service provider corresponding to the matched SID from the plurality of SIDs is declared to be a home service provider for the mobile station.

Thus, claims 2, 3, and 11 are not made obvious by Bridges, Mauney, and/or Mizikovsky.

Furthermore, there is an inconsistency in the rejection of claim 11 found on page 12, lines 13-14, item 5. Claim 10 is the base claim for claim 11. Claim 10 was rejected by Bridges,

Serial No.: 09/965,784  
Art Unit: 2618

Mauney and McGregor where the Patent Office alleged, on page 8, lines 1-3, of the Office Action dated January 29 2008, that “Bridges and Mauney, in combination, fails to teach in mobile stations associated with a prepaid service provider at least one memory storing a SID that identifies a Home service provider for the mobile station” and that McGregor teaches this difference. In the header of item 5, there is no mention of McGregor nor is there mention of McGregor in the body of the rejection.

The Patent Office rejected claims 5, 6, 8, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Bridges, in view of Mauney and further in view of Bamburak, U.S. Patent No. 6,807,418.

The Patent Office considers Bridges to teach a first SID (paragraph 0013), a plurality of second SIDs (paragraph 0064), and that comparing the SIDs and declaring a Home category service provider (paragraphs 0060). Bridges does not disclose declaring a wireless service provider as being a home service provider for the mobile station after storing a SID as a home service provider and after comparing a received SID to at least one of a plurality of stored SIDs.

Bridges discloses, as his invention, the Preferred System Identification List (PSL) and/or an Intelligent Roaming Database Downloading (IRDB) is accessed to indicate the band where the mobile station is to find a preferred system (paragraph 0046).

The disclosure in Bamburak is clear that there is only one home service provider (e.g., column 11, lines 1-6). In column 11, lines 22-29, Bamburak indicates that the mobile station will register on a neutral service provider if the home service provider is not found, a partner service provider is not found, and a preferred service provider is not found. Column 11, lines 22-29, of Bambaruk disclose as follows:

(5) neutral--a service provider not identified by a SID or SOC entry in the table of FIG. 10. The mobile communication device will register on a neutral service provider if none of home, partner, or preferred service providers are found. On certain events such as a control channel change and/or periodically, the mobile communication device will search other frequency bands for a home, partner, or preferred service provider.

Claim 6 recites “if none of the plurality of stored system identifications matches the received system identification, further comprising comparing a received system operator code to stored system operator codes, including at least one of a partner system operator code, a favored

Serial No.: 09/965,784  
Art Unit: 2618

system operator code and a forbidden system operator code and if a match is found between the received system operator code and one of the partner and favored system operator codes, declaring a wireless service provider corresponding to the matched one of the partner and favored system operator codes to be the home service provider.”

Since claim 6 is similar to claim 26, it is not understood why claim 26 is allowed and claim 6 is rejected. Without explicitly or impliedly admitting that further amendment to claim 6 is needed, Applicant has amended claim 6 to be more in line with claim 26 to advance prosecution.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 6 recites patentable subject matter.

Claims 5, 6, 8, and 19 are allowable for the same reasons their respective base claims 1 and 17 are allowable.

Thus, claims 5, 6, 8, and 19 are allowable over Bridges, Mauney, and/or Bamburak.

The Patent Office rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Bridges, Mauney, and McGregor, and further in view of Mizikovsky.

It does not appear that Bridges, Mauney, McGregor, or Mizikovsky discloses or suggests “a list containing a plurality of other SIDs having a common spatial characteristic.” Mizikovsky, in particular, does not disclose or suggest such a list.

Thus, claim 11 is allowable over Bridges, Mauney, McGregor, and/or Mizikovsky.

The Patent Office rejected claims 13, 14, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Bridges, Mauney, and McGregor, and further in view of Bamburak.

None of Bridges, Mauney, McGregor, or Bamburak disclose or suggest comparing a received SID to SIDs on a list containing a plurality of other SIDs having a common spatial characteristic to declare a home service provider (subject matter found in base claim 10).

Thus, claim 11 is allowable over the prior art of record.

The Patent Office rejected claims 13, 14, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Bridges, Mauney, and McGregor, and further in view of Bamburak.

None of Bridges, Mauney, McGregor, or Bamburak disclose or suggest comparing a received SID to SIDs on a list containing a plurality of other SIDs having a common spatial

Serial No.: 09/965,784  
Art Unit: 2618

characteristic to declare a home service provider (subject matter found in base claim 10).

Thus, claims 13, 14, and 16 allowable over the prior art of record.

Since claim 14 is similar to claim 26, it is not understood why claim 26 is allowed and claim 14 is rejected. Without explicitly or impliedly admitting that further amendment to claim 6 is needed, Applicant has amended claim 14 to be more in line with claim 26 to advance prosecution.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 14 recites patentable subject matter.

The Patent Office rejected claims 29 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Bridges in view of Mauney and further in view of Osmani, U.S. Patent No. 5,815,807.

Osmani discloses (column 1, lines 42-49) "Billing services for radiotelephone subscriber units include prepaid short term billing structures such as calling cards and debit cards and postpaid periodic billing structures. Cellular communication systems are owned and operated for profit by communications companies who typically sell use of the system based on the amount of time spent by the user on the system and the distance involved between the communicating locations. Users may lease or buy cellular phones in order to use them on the system."

As discussed above, Bridges in view of Mauney does not make obvious either claim 1 or claim 17 and does not disclose or make obvious declaring a wireless service provider as being a home service provider or home category service provider. Osmani does not remedy the deficiency of Bridges in view of Mauney.

Thus, claims 29 and 30 are allowable over the prior art of record.

New claims 31 and 32 are believed to be allowable with respect to the prior art of record.

The Patent Office is respectfully requested to reconsider and remove the rejections of the claims 1-17, 19, and 28-30 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on Bridges, Mauney, McGregor, Mizikovsky, Bamburak, and/ or Osmani, and to allow all of the pending claims 1-17, 19, 20, and 22-32 as now presented for examination. An early notification of the allowability of claims 1-17, 19, 20, and 22-32 is earnestly solicited.

Serial No.: 09/965,784  
Art Unit: 2618

Respectfully submitted:

Walter J. Malinowski      June 17, 2008  
Walter J. Malinowski      Date

Reg. No.: 43,423

Customer No.: 29683

HARRINGTON & SMITH, PC  
4 Research Drive  
Shelton, CT 06484-6212

Telephone: (203) 925-9400, extension 19  
Facsimile: (203) 944-0245  
email: wmalinowski@hspatent.com

#### CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. BOX 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

6/17/2008      Maureen F. Moran  
Date      Name of Person Making Deposit